

CORALLORRHIZA STRIATA *Lindley*,
A MIXTURE

BY
LOUIS O. WILLIAMS

IN STUDYING THE ORIGINAL DESCRIPTION of *Corallorrhiza striata* Lindley (Gen. & Sp. Orch. Pl. (1840) 534), it was found to disagree with the interpretation generally given the species by American authors. *C. striata* was described as having a trilobulate lip, a character which is unknown in *C. striata* as commonly understood.

Lindley's type specimen is a mixture of *C. striata*, as that species is usually interpreted, with another species of Corallorrhiza, very probably *C. maculata* Raf. Fortunately there is a good photograph of the type specimen in the Ames Herbarium. This photograph of the Lindley type shows parts of three plants collected by Douglas in "N. W. America" and a sketch (by Lindley) of a flower and lip. Only the left hand inflorescence is referable to *C. striata* in its present accepted sense, and is the only material having striate flowers. Consequently this material should be accepted as the true type of Lindley's *C. striata*, in spite of the discrepancies written into the original description.

A probable duplicate of the Douglas collection, on which Lindley's species is based, is to be found in the Gray Herbarium: it is *C. striata* of traditional usage.

If we consider the technical characters of Lindley's description, the sketch of the flower which he made and the fact that most of the material upon which he based the species is probably *C. maculata*, one might feel justified in reducing it to synonymy under *C. maculata*. There are, however, several considerations which argue for the retention of the name *C. striata* in the traditional usage:

1. The name *striata* must have been taken from that

part of the type which had striate perianth parts, hence the name would not apply well to *C. maculata*.

2. The name is well established in botanical literature and there has been little or no confusion in its application.

3. The type sheet bears a specimen of *C. striata* and the description applies to that specimen, in major part.

4. To take up another name for the plant would cause confusion and serve no useful purpose.

It is suggested, therefore, that the use of the name *C. striata* Lindl. be continued in the traditional sense. Toward this end it is proposed that the specimen on the left side of Lindley's type sheet be considered as the type and that the other specimens and the sketch on the sheet be disregarded in the typification of the species.